

Facilities Planning Committee Meeting
Fawcett Center, Alumni Lounge
September 10, 2004

Judge Robert M. Duncan:

We have a number of agenda items first which we are going to cover. Then, as I understand it, we have two speakers, who will then address us, 15 minutes each, at the conclusion of the agenda items.

For the first agenda item, I will call on Mr. William Shkurti, senior vice president for Business and Finance, who will discuss the "Context for Planning" concerning the facility.

Mr. William J. Shkurti:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The University is proceeding today with a review of a draft 2004 University Airport Master Plan being presented by the College of Engineering. The anticipated culmination of this review will be consideration of the plan by the Board of Trustees at the November and December meetings and it is important to understand the context in which this planning and review take place. That context involves a long history of master planning at the University and the airport with a defined process to ensure appropriate review and consideration.

The airport itself was established by the OSU Board of Trustees in November 1942. Its first master plan was developed in January 1961 and then subsequent revisions and updates were approved by the OSU Board of Trustees in 1972, 1978 and, most recently, February of 1990.

The University itself has had a master planning process – of course, the University was established in 1870 and the first master planning began in the 1880s. The first University Master Plan was developed at about the same time as the first airport master plan, interestingly enough, and that was in February 1962. The current University Master Plan was adopted by the Board in October 1995, with subsequent additions of district plans.

In all of the University's master planning activities, including those for the airport, there are certain principles that guide these efforts. I just want to highlight those briefly; there are five of them. Number one is alignment with the University's mission of teaching, research, and service. The proposed airport plan must be evaluated in terms of how it will enable the airport to serve that mission, and that includes ensuring that the plan is based on reasonable projections of need rather than just the possibility of growth for growth's sake. It also means that the plan must provide guidance to shape and guide how future needs will be met, not as a directive for the development for the airport, but as guidance and, if it is determined that development is needed, a way to move forward. A key part of that alignment is the academic plan for the aviation program and that is what Dean Baeslack will discuss later in this hearing.

The second principle is adherence to external requirements and we have a very important partner in this process which is the Federal Aviation Administration, so that we need to make sure that whatever we do is consistent with the requirements and procedures of that organization. The University is committed to working cooperatively with the FAA, not only to see that these needs are met but to explore better ways to align the FAA, the University, and community concerns. For the University, the FAA requirements represent the minimum process, not the maximum.

The third principle is that this planning process is a deliberative process with periodic review and updating. This proposed plan is an update of the plan last adopted by the Board of Trustees in 1990 and subsequently approved by the FAA. As was the case with that plan, the process for vetting, this plan is deliberative and must be based on all the factors that need to be considered. That is why it has taken some time to get to the point where we are at today when the various elements are defined and the University review can proceed.

The fourth principle is the appropriate involvement and input from surrounding communities and neighborhoods. This is not only an FAA requirement, but more importantly, a central tenet of University and airport planning. The University does not exist in a vacuum and especially our service mission cannot be undertaken successfully if we do not consult with those affected outside the institution. That does not mean the University abdicates its mission to community consensus, even if consensus is possible, but that it carefully considers the impact of University activities beyond our campus. The opportunity for comment and input does not end with the FAA-mandated process and the University will provide for additional community and neighborhood input as we move forward with this review.

The final principle is that master plans are not self-executing. The 1961 master plan stated in the very first paragraph, "the inclusion of any new facility does not reflect a decision to proceed with its construction, but rather a determination to make ample advance allowance for such expansion as might be needed at some future date." Additionally, the Board of Trustees, in approving the 1961 master plan, noted that the approval "does not preclude the need for the usual actions by the Board of Trustees, as each part of the plan is implemented in the future."

Several components of the 1990 plan, including the possible extension of the north runway have yet to be acted upon, so it is important to emphasize that any capital project in the proposed plan would require separate, subsequent University and Board authorization before it can be undertaken. The University would anticipate that if the plan were to be approved in December of 2004, it would probably be at least another six months, possibly more, before the airport might seek approval for the north runway project. The project would then be subject to Board approval.

This meeting of the Board's Facilities Planning Committee is the next step as the University proceeds with a review of the proposed airport plan. The purpose of this meeting is to give the committee an early preview of the plan's components and other elements incorporated into this review, for example, the noise analysis, the aviation academic plan, the business plan, and so forth, and to outline the review process to be followed and, finally to solicit committee input with respect to the plan and the process.

In the coming weeks, there will be additional meetings and venues for public comment and input. The College of Engineering will begin to move the process through the University's process to make sure that all the elements of the plan are fully vetted within the University and eventually to go back to the Board of Trustees at the November meeting of the Fiscal Affairs Committee for a presentation. The University planning studies are all subject to a two-meeting rule to give the Trustees ample opportunity for final review, so the plan would then be on the agenda for the December meeting for action as determined by the Trustees. If for any reason this schedule slips, there could be consideration at the February 2005 meeting.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my presentation. If there are any questions, I would be glad to respond.

Judge Duncan:

Thank you. Any questions from members of the Committee? Very well. I will now call on Dean William Baeslack, dean of The Ohio State University College of Engineering.

Dean William A. Baeslack III: [PowerPoint Presentation]

Good morning. I am pleased to be here to talk to you about the airport, the aviation program, and the master plan. I have provided detailed handouts of this PowerPoint presentation that is at all of your places. I have also provided you with the timeline regarding the review of the master plan and the process that we will go through over the next few months that Mr. Shkurti alluded to, some letters of support from local community leaders, and also a one or two page write up on what you are going to see today.

Let me move through this fairly quickly. Again, we are going to talk about a couple different aspects this morning: 1) the academics and aviation, an important part of this issue and presentation relates to the support of the airport to the academic program for the aviation program and how the airport master plan

status benefits the aviation program; 2) the recently released environmental assessment, including the noise study; and 3) a summary and final comments.

Before I begin, let me introduce Dr. Taneja, chair of the Department of Aerospace and Aviation Department, and Doug Hammon, director of the airport. I may, at some time, refer questions to them as those arise.

Just a little history – the aviation program at Ohio State goes back to 1917. It was established as a school in 1942 by the Board of Trustees and the Board of Regents approved bachelor's degrees in aviation in 1981. So it is a program with tremendous history, tremendous impact at the University and the State of Ohio, and nationally, as I think you will see as I go through this presentation.

Aviation is a national priority. This is a quote from a major task force report from the federal government: "We need national leadership to develop an air transportation systems that simultaneously meets our civil aviation, national defense and homeland security needs."

Currently over 40 universities and colleges offer a bachelor's degree in aviation-related programs, including our partners in the Big Ten – Purdue University and Illinois – who both have airports affiliated with those programs.

Just a couple of comments on organizational relationships. The aviation program is administered by the Department of Aerospace Engineering and Aviation, which is chaired by Dr. Taneja. The program is responsible to the College of Engineering, so he reports to me in that capacity as chair. The department is responsible for managing and operating the airport and the airport director Doug Hammon reports to the chair of that department.

The program is about, as I think you are aware, to return to independent department status based on a proposal by the College of Engineering that has been up through the Board of Trustees and that will happen probably sometime during the end of the year. After that occurs, the Department of Aviation will be responsible for the airport management.

Just again some continuation here of these relationships – the aviation program contributes to the College's teaching, research, and service outreach missions and supports the overarching goals of the University's Academic Plan. The airport is an earnings unit that reports to the Aviation program and, again, strongly supports the teaching, research, and service outreach missions. Finally, the University's Academic Mission is in fact the primary force driving airport development needs.

This relationship benefits the aviation program, the College, and the University and controls the direction and destiny of the OSU airport. In terms of supporting the academic program this is essential. For example, because of that control by the College of Engineering we do not deal with many of the issues at this airport that we would have to deal with if this was a county, local, or community airport.

Projects benefiting from aviation are the highest priority of the management of the airport and Dr. Taneja, while meeting the FAA standards. All the academic program revisions and airport plans are reviewed, proposed, approved through rigorous, formal, well-established University channels of approval, culminating in approval by the Board.

Just some background information on the program. It is viewed nationally as a top-notch aviation program. Our students do extremely well. For example, they are well qualified in terms of jobs and are highly sought after by industry and business, and this is a major business industry in Ohio and nationally. Our students do well in competitions. Five of the presidents of the national Aviation Association have been from Ohio State, including Professor Gerald Chubb who is the current president. Again, our graduates are in high demand throughout industry.

It supports the Academic Plan in many different ways. You can match up the different plans and look at the University plan, which strongly supports the land-grant mission to address and support society's most compelling needs.

It provides intrinsically multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary program. This is a program that actually offers degrees in three colleges. It offers a degree in Engineering, in Arts and Sciences, and there is a specialty in the Fisher College of Business. So that leads to a very interdisciplinary type of academic program and certainly also leads to many opportunities for interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary scholarship and research activities.

It sets a high standard for dissemination of knowledge to the community. In many ways the airport serves as an extension service to community airports who have issues and questions. People can come to the airport and seek that information.

Finally, we are committed to diversity, which is an important part of the Academic Plan of the University. A high proportion of students and instructors are women and, in fact, our chief flight instructor is woman.

The teaching mission of the program is to provide a bachelor's and graduate education to persons pursuing careers in the field of aviation, to provide an academic program that prepares our students, to provide a foundation, develop and function as professionals responsible for design and management operation of tomorrow's safe and efficient national and international aviation systems.

I think the point here is that this is – there is a perception by some, I believe, that this is a flying school at the airport. It is that because students do take pilot instruction, but the fact is this is an aviation program that provides professionals to the industry. And I think you will see some examples of some of those individuals a little later and some slides, but that is a key part of this. We are a comprehensive, rigorous academic program that leads to bachelor's of science and bachelor's of arts degrees.

In fact, here are the programs again: in Engineering, Arts and Sciences, the management specialty. There are currently two areas of concentration: aircraft systems and aviation management. We are actually seeking a third in air transportation that will perhaps support a master's program also in these areas.

About half of the students take flight training – at the current time, there are about 225 students in the program. About 110 take flight training typically through a commercial instrument type of status. Again, that is currently the status there. About 60 students, I believe, 65 students graduated from the program last year. The majority of those students are actually Arts and Sciences students.

The airport enhances the aviation-teaching mission. In the next few slides we will review the missions and how the airport actually supports them. The airport provides a real world-learning laboratory for aviation students, in and out of the classroom. I spent about a half-a-day at the airport about a week ago, and met with students and the staff. I was somewhat familiar with the airport previous to returning to Ohio State, and it is clear – it is a laboratory. They are there, they were in flight instruction, their classes are there, the flight simulators are there, the classrooms. Many of them, as is indicated in some of these other slides, are internships. They work at the airport, in co-op experiences. They are immersed in it and that is key to the fact that what our goal is, is to produce leaders in the aviation field, professionals. Some are internships, year-round work experiences as flight instructors, operations, and management that prepare the students for life after graduation.

Again, the airport, being it is our airport, provides flexible priority access to space close to the campus. This is a real issue with the students. They are full-time students coming back here and taking courses across the curriculum, in business, in arts and sciences, and engineering to support their degree programs. That access, that flexibility of scheduling, the close distance is essential. They were very clear about this to me in the discussion, the importance of the OSU airport providing that service.

Here is an example of a couple of our students – this is a senior and flight instructor, who was a graduate, just evaluating some flight performance, actually looking at climb rates at different speeds. So they actually

do analysis and they go back and they will look at the aircraft performance characteristics as defined by the manufacturer, they will also do modeling and simulation, doing computational modeling, and they will make those comparisons with the experiments.

Again, a research mission – to conduct research on real problems concerning the safe and efficient operation and aircraft to national and international aviation systems. Since 1992, about \$4.1 million in research supported by the FAA, NASA, DOD, aircraft manufacturers. Research includes areas of avionics, evaluation of flight system displays, pilot risk analysis, aviation psychology, human factors, and a number of other areas.

Just an example, Professor Chuck Hall, who was actually visiting here from NC State, working collaboratively with Jerry Gregorek, who is a professor in the department, and a graduate, using an experimental portable device that he produced actually that evaluates in-flight characteristics of the aircraft. When that is completed, they bring it down, they process the data, they compare with modeled and simulation performance data. So it is a great program.

Just another example of a student who received a master's, Chrissy Liu. Her work looked at an advanced simulator system, the SmartDeck system, this is actually a simulation of that, compared it with other systems looking at pilot situation awareness. In other words, how does this system assist pilots when something unexpected occurs in the aircraft? This system is designed – they actually compared the response of this and the assistance that this provides to the pilot relative to a more conventional system.

The airport advances the research mission in many ways. It provides lab space for programs in aviation. It also provides space and laboratories for other activities and research across the campus: the ElectroScience lab, many of you are aware the Gas Turbine lab is located at the field, and computer science.

The service mission – it provides aviation professionals who become the leaders of the industry, serve the community through faculty participation in matters concerning aviation, serve the local community obviously by providing flight instruction, serve the department, University, and community through management and operation of the OSU airport.

Flight clinics – some examples of the service. We support the local Eagles program, Explorer Post, K-12 types of programs. We are consultants, both from the airport and our faculty, across Ohio and national to NetJets, county airports, as I mentioned earlier, and we host conferences, for example, national conferences on safety and flight education.

Just some examples of some of our graduates – a couple of pilots from Southwest Airlines. I think it is important to mention that most of our graduates do not end up as pilots. In fact, a relatively small proportion end up as pilots at this level. They more often end up in airport managements, in operations, in those areas. Here is Sean Menke, who is the COO of Frontier Airlines, a 1991 graduate as you can see in Arts and Sciences. The previous two individuals were engineering program graduates.

This is some of 130 OSU aviation alums at NetJets here is Columbus. And again, the majority of these individuals are not flying for NetJets. They are providing support service in many different ways.

So this is an important industry and Ohio State provides an important service. Again, that is very consistent with our land-grant mission.

An economic analysis shows us providing about \$4.3 million in direct impacts, about \$37 million in indirect, and \$31.1 million in induced economic impacts to the community. So significant economic impact in benefits to the local community.

Just a final slide in this portion – the airport provides cash and in-kind resources of about \$650,000 to augment the aviation programs' academic and research efforts, thereby improving the excellence of the program. This is an important contribution. The vast majority of this is not cash; it is in-kind, for example,

subsidized costs of fuel, subsidized costs of service on the aircraft. We are not being charged there, the flight instruction facilities – they are not being charged space costs and that sort of thing. So much of this is actually in-kind sort of support to the program.

Let me switch gears to the second part of this presentation. The system was unable to take both of these files. Let me move to present now the master plan presentation and complete this with that.

The master plan – again, and there are copies available of that and the environmental assessment report for Board members here.

Judge Duncan:

Could I ask you a question? As far as faculty in aviation programs, do we have an experienced faculty? What can you say about the character of the faculty?

Dean Baeslack:

We have some very experienced faculty. Dr. Taneja, who is the chair of the department, in aviation, is a very well-known renowned faculty member in that area nationally. Jerry Chubb, who is the current president of the national association, is a person who I have worked with. We helped bring one of these FAA airworthiness assurance centers several years ago – some of you may remember that – to Ohio State. He is another very highly-recognized, well-recognized faculty member. Certainly, if you look at the Academic Plan, and certainly one of the reasons for breaking this program out of the department is because of the value we place on it in the College to make it an independent department once again and that will also lead to some additional faculty hiring to support that program. But there currently are outstanding faculty in that program.

Let me move through this master plan discussion. OSU airport – this is a circa 1946 photograph of the airport. It was a bit smaller then, obviously, and the land around it was less developed. This is the airport today and I think you are familiar with this layout – Sawmill is on the left, Case Road is on the south, going left to right.

The airport mission statement – I am not going to read all this – but the point here is that the mission statement of the airport strongly emphasizes the support of the airport toward the academic program – teaching, research, public service. Learning laboratory, professional experience for the students – those are the highlights of this mission statement. And we will continue to explore. The airport also is progressive, it is using that academic base to explore and implement progressive concepts in airport services and facilities.

We want to graduate students who are at the cutting edge, you know, in terms of airport management and service, not who are just familiar with the current technology. This airport provides that laboratory to do that.

The bottom line is that we will also operate and manage the airport in a manner that is compatible and sensitive to the needs of the surrounding community.

The airport master plan – it is a 20-year development plan that identifies capital projects for short-term (five-year), medium-term (10-year), and long-term (20-year) periods; considers and forecasts future aviation demands, along with land and facility requirements; complies with the FAA's recommended 10-year update cycle. And this is required, as you probably are aware. Much of the development that occurs at the airport, particularly runway development and key development like that occurs through FAA support, a large part of that. For example, the runway extension would be covered 90 percent by the FAA. And the only way in which the FAA will provide that financial support is if you have an updated master plan. So that is an important part of this entire issue.

Some background information on based aircraft. You can look at the numbers here and see. This is a total number from 1976 to 2023 (projected). Currently, for example, we have 19 jet aircraft with a total of 230. This is actually down in total from, say, 1990, when there were 282. In that period there were actually 60 Huey helicopters from the National Guard located which we moved out of there and that reduced that number beyond 1990. But, as you can see, there are currently 19 jet aircraft, projected in the plan to go up to 25 in five years, in 2008, an increase of 6 jet-based aircraft at that point.

Mr. O'Dell:

Why is it growing like that?

Dean Baeslack:

The growth there is just natural growth of the industry. It is also based on the fact that we are going to add, you will see here, some hangars that will house a few more planes. I think it is 8-10 hangars that could house some additional jet aircraft. That is pretty much it. Also, in terms of the based aircraft those are the reasons for that.

In terms of aircraft operations, you can see here where we are at. This year, about 8,300 jet aircraft operations out of a total of 101,000 and that is compared to about 6,000 in 1990 for a total of 140,757. Notice that the total numbers of operations is down significantly from 205,000 back in 1976. Yes?

Mr. Borrer:

Is that takeoffs or landings?

Dean Baeslack:

It is separate – it is an event. Is that correct, Nawal? It is a single event, either a takeoff or a landing.

So, if you do the math, you will see that the difference between 2003 and 1990 is probably a few days, if you look at that.

A number of companies use the airport. This is a list of Fortune 500 companies who use the OSU airport and you will recognize many of those as being local companies also and I am going to go through this fairly quickly. The next slide shows actually local companies who use the airport: Cardinal Health, Worthington Industries, many other, Scotts, many other of our local leading industries.

Comparison of the two plans and this is 1990 versus 2004. You can see that they are very similar. The runway extension actually was proposed and approved in 1990. The difference is that we were proposing to extend the crosswind runway in 1990 and we are proposing now to remove that and then they are also adding potentially some north hangar development. But that is an out-year development, probably a 10 or 20 out-year development.

Airport master plan landside projects. Let me review these quickly. First is a flight education center replacement. This will construct a new building that houses classrooms, research labs, test centers. Issues with the current hangar – it was built in the 1950s. Again, I spent some time out there and I can attribute to the fact that it would be great to have a new building. It will be supported by donations and gifts. The benefits of course would be new classrooms for the students, aircraft flight simulators, testing, new research labs, increased potential for sponsored research, both at the undergraduate and at the graduate level, and improved image which would be important in attracting higher quality students and a broader base of students, and overall enhance the reputation of the University and of the program.

The south hanger construction is shown here. The proposal is to add some corporate row and T hangars – about 50 in total. About eight of those will be capable of housing jets. The last hangars were built in 1985;

we currently have a wait list of 120 individuals and companies waiting for hangars there. So this would not meet that requirement, but certainly help a bit.

Increased aircraft operations will be an impact, but at the level that I showed in those previous slides. Benefits: improved service to customers, increased based aircraft, increased revenues. But I am highlighting in red as we go through these slides how it benefits the students and the Academic Plan and this will lead to increase student employment. Many of our students work as co-ops and interns in that capacity.

The terminal building construction/renovation. The facilities are outdated. They are attractive; they kept them up; they are renovated, if you been in and out of there. But certainly you can tell that they are dated – they are from 1943. Support again is gift support through the Friends of OSU Airport. It would provide enhanced images, improve service to students and to business.

North hangar construction – again, this is an out-year proposal, 10-20 years. It would be a public/private partnership. In fact, we just do not have the space on the south side for any development. It would lead to increased student internship, co-op opportunities, research opportunities with companies located there. It could attract R&D firms, assist in local economic initiatives in the area and, of course, increase revenues to support the Academic Plan.

Let me move on and finish up here by covering the OSU airport master plan airside and the noise study. The primary runway extension here as you can see and this is also in the handouts. The north runway will be extended to the left and to the right in this picture – 1,200 feet to the east, 1,800 to the west and that is shown by these yellow lines up at the top. There is also of course an extension of the taxiway along side that runway.

Again, this is to extend the runway to 6,000 feet. The issue is that the current number of operations exceeds the FAA threshold. The FAA recommends when you get above about 500 flights with the jets that we have out there that you have a 6,000-foot runway. We have a 5,000-foot runway. We have over 2,000 of those flights so we significantly exceed that. That is particularly important from a safety standpoint again in particular during inclement weather. That is a serious safety issue we feel we have to deal with. So to improve safety and service to students and corporate users.

Overall, improvement of the surrounding community will result as you will see in the noise analysis, that extension and the preferred scenario actually results on average in less of a noise issue in the surrounding community. Slight increase in aircraft operations and FAA 90 percent and airport 10 percent in terms of the funding. Let me back up, In terms of saying a serious issue; I wouldn't call it a serious issue, but it is a safety issue in terms of the need to extend that and one that we want to address.

Crosswind runway removal; you can see the runway that goes across, covered by the two Xs. That will be removed. The reason for that is it is a low use facility; it is not used commonly by students or the corporate folks. It has too many intersections. It improves ground movement safety. When you have that crosswind runway there, there are just more opportunities for a situation. Funding again for that type of an activity would occur from the FAA at 90 percent and from the airport at 10 percent.

The environmental impact assessment is currently being completed. The report is being provided. The EA examines 21 environmental categories including aircraft noise. This is a summary of those. It ranges from noise, social impacts, air quality, water quality, biotic communities. Basically no impact in virtually all of these. Water quality they show as a possible impact, probably during construction, request permits to be required, minor impact there. Minor impact to species that utilize forested areas, as you would expect. And streams and ditches, again, perhaps primarily during the construction period. No impact on threatened or endangered species. Many of these are not relevant actually, given you know coastal barriers and some of those aspects, coastal zones.

Energy supply and natural resources – no significant impact. Light emissions, solid waste – no significant impact. Construction – again, some short-term issues with noise and air during the construction. So generally speaking, I think there is essentially negligible impact of what is being proposed.

Noise analysis – actual noise levels were measured with monitors under full compliance. Some of this background information has been discussed with the Airport Advisory Committee, which includes significant community involvement, including involvement of the development of these procedures. And so some of this I think some of you are already familiar with.

Future noise levels have been predicted using an FAA and EPA approved integrated noise model and analysis design conducted again with the full input of the community. Just a little bit of engineering and science here – the EPA and FAA define 65 decibels as the critical Day Night Average Sound Level (DNL). The DNL was the cumulative average of the noise exposure during the 24-hour period. And there is a 10 dB penalty added to noise events that occur in the evening (between 11 p.m. and 7 a.m.). You will hear me referring to the 65 DNL level and that is an important FAA issue.

Here is a map of where some of those are located and actually you probably cannot read this, you can see it in your handouts. These are the 65 DNLs, four different locations where the monitors were placed around the airport and you can see outside of the airport boundary, there were none that exceeded that 65.

(inaudible question)

Dean Baeslack:

I presume those were based on the analysis technique, in terms of the tools, a model. I will not refer to the consultant but I presume the consultant worked within terms of knowing – based on the model and analysis – of where those needed to be placed. There were also some, I think, placed even in the downtown Worthington area – correct? – because they wanted to understand the noise impacts say at the High Street and 161 area there.

So a couple of additional terms – noise sensitive receiver is an individual residence, hospital, hotel, or church. So an individual home would be an individual noise sensitive receiver. And a significant noise impact occurs if an analysis shows that proposed improvements would cause that receiver to reach a noise of the 65 dB average or higher.

I will look at some different scenarios: existing conditions; the no-build scenario which basically says we do not do anything, just light improvements and improvements will actually occur in the noise there, in terms of becoming less because of the improved engine technology. I think you will see that.

The preferred short-term alternative includes: the new south side hangars, north runway extension, normal industry growth and, again, improved engine technology and a full master plan build – long-term 20 years includes the north side hangars.

If you look at the current noise level and let me use the arrow to show a couple of these. If you look at it, we are in fact – this is just recently obtained information – this green represents the outer extreme of the 65 limit. You can see we are actually catching some homes out in this area and a few out here. The rest of it – the north runway of course which does not involve jet aircraft at this point is not an issue. So there is some extension of that beyond the airport property here and here and if you look at the next slide... So no noise issues exist around the north runway; the south 65 DNL extends into residential areas. Twenty-seven homes west of the airport and four homes east of the airport are impacted.

On finding this out, we have actually been in discussion with the FAA in terms of how to address this. There are a number of approaches to that and we are currently working with them in that regard.

The no-build noise – in fact what you see is because of an improvement in engine technology, these areas actually come back in to move out of the areas across Sawmill and at this end, and so in fact if you look at

the results of this – just another point, the yellow is a 70 dB limit area and this is a 75 dB area in here. So there are actually three different noise levels indicated here.

(inaudible question)

Dean Baeslack:

That would be the average, again. In five years, if we do nothing, this is what occurs. Sorry for not providing that clarification. So under the no-build scenario, in five years with reduced engine noise due to improvements in aircraft technology, the DNL 65 level extends on the airport property only to the southeast and no homes are affected.

If you look at the preferred short-term alternative – again, this is the hangar the runway extension, now you see the noise extends up on the north runway. Here is Sawmill again, so here is the end of that 65. It extends a little bit up into this corporate area up here and a little bit down to the south, off the airport boundaries. But if you look at the results in terms of these indicators, it only extends, again, off the north and southeast slightly. The noise level decreases for the majority – there is data we have where they have actually looked at this model around these different areas that were mapped and from the majority of those the noise goes down. Now, as you would expect, the noise goes up some at the west end and the east end of the north runway which, because of the shift from the south to the north. But no homes are affected where the DNL is over 65 dB.

The last scenario, the full build – again, as you would expect, because of more of a larger number of aircraft, the average goes up and then we push this 65 out just about to Sawmill, here, catching that corporate area again. But when you do the analysis in detail, again, what you find is it extends off the airport to the north southeast but the bottom line is that no homes are affected where this DNL is over 65 dB. So, the bottom line is when you look at the scenarios, from the no-build scenario to the full-build, when you do the noise analysis, the 65 DNL limit does not extend into any of these noise-sensitive indicators. That is, I think, an important result.

Mr. O'Dell:

What about flying at night? What did you assume about flying at night when you came to this conclusion?

Dean Baeslack:

That is the penalty that they give you...

Mr. O'Dell:

I know. So are you assuming we are doing a lot of flying at night, or no flying at night, or...?

Dean Baeslack:

No, the flying at night – I presume they use the same model in the early evening that they currently do, but between, say, 11 p.m. and 7 a.m., I assume, I can ask – what was the assumption there?

Mr. Douglas E. Hammon:

They were looking at our night operations, we will say, as they are today. I think we have roughly about 12 aircraft a night come in and out.

Dean Baeslack:

And what time is that?

Mr. Hammon:

That is between the 11 and 7 o'clock period.

Mr. O'Dell:

Is there any time where it is shut down entirely?

Mr. Hammon:

The airport physically, no; the operations are.

Dean Baeslack:

Being an FAA facility, the airport cannot legally shut down. Is that correct?

Mr. Hammon:

It is very difficult to get FAA approval to shut down.

Dean Baeslack:

So community support, let me just again move forward here. Letters of support from airport neighbors – I have provided you with some of those from some of the community groups, three of the community groups around the airport support the runway extension and the activities. Resolutions of support from four resident associations – okay, I mentioned that. The airport is included in local economic development initiatives. So, again, this is an activity that strongly supports the community.

Let me summarize. The master plan supports the future mission, again, as I described in the earlier part of my presentation, this is an important part and does strongly support the academic program and the sustaining of the quality and the growth of that program in terms of its excellence and quality and reputation, while serving the communities and contributing to their economic vitality.

Key components of this preferred build are new hangars on the south side, about 50 hangars with about eight of those to support jets and runway improvements, as I have just described. Additional components include a new flight education center, a new terminal, and north side development. North side development is, again, an out-year, 10-20 year development. The preferred development option will result in compliance with FAA and EPA environmental guidelines while overall reducing the noise in the surrounding neighborhoods.

Just a closing comment. The airport and the college will continue to communicate and cooperate with the surrounding community, representatives that strengthen the existing mutually beneficial relationship. And as the new dean of Engineering, I am committed to making that happen. We met yesterday with some representatives from Worthington City Council and so we are out talking to folks and we will continue to do that. We are sensitive, certainly, to the issues of the community and will continue to listen and to address those in serious and proactive manner.

Thank you.

Mr. Borrer:

Dean, thank you very much for the presentation. I have two questions and they are not really related, but I will ask them together. One, do you have any data about what is the east-west relationship to the number of landings and takeoffs? I think the wind has something to do with that. And then the second question is

when you show – you are making the runway longer and you are going to increase traffic, and yet the noise goes down. Could you explain why?

Dean Baeslack:

I may refer some of these. Certainly there is a much larger proportion that takeoff to the west. What is that ratio?

Mr. Hammon:

About 60:40.

Dean Baeslack:

60:40? In terms of that.

Mr. Borrer:

Landings also?

Mr. Hammon:

Right.

Dean Baeslack:

Right. The change and the improvement is primarily – number one, I think if you look at the total number of changes proposed, it is not tremendous. You saw the actual per day. I think if you look at today versus the preferred build, my recollection is the increase in landings and takeoffs of jets, and jets are the primary noise issue, as you would expect, I believe changes about 10 per day.

But what is happening is that, of course, I think based on federal government guidelines and based – Dr. Taneja, jump in here if I am being a little off based – the technology of the engines are improving significantly and they are going through these different – it is not generation, but 2,3,4, types of jet aircraft engines. In the newer planes, for example, the Lear 35 is one level up. I think it is a 3 versus a 2 versus the Lear 25, which is the older plane. So, over the next few years, the technology will improve, the engines will get quieter, and this is not just happening obviously with corporate planes, it is happening with large commercial airliners also. And that will actually, in the model, result when you run that analysis in the pulling back there will be less noise, and so it pulls back those iso noise lines – the 65 – to within. So it does improve. Even the no-build, because of that technology change results in it.

When you add the number of jet experiences associated with the addition of the hangars and the industry increase as we showed here, that still is offset, that is more than offset by the technology improvement. Any additions there?

Professor Nawal K. Taneja:

May I add something to this? The biggest airplane that can come in is coming in right now. So it is not by making the runway bigger you are now going to attract even bigger airplanes. No, the biggest that can come in is coming in right now. But what happens is that they are coming in on this 5,000-foot runway. Therefore, the profile with which they come in – meaning the height and the degree is different. If you give them more room, they are going to come in with a different profile. Right? And that profile will, in fact, reduce the noise, not increase it. That is one element.

The other element is that if you increase the runway, the old plane that is going to take off – if it is taking off from a longer runway, it can have more fuel, not make more noise, but it can have more fuel; therefore, it can fly longer distances. So, if one of our based airplanes from one of our companies here and they want to fly non-stop to, I am making up a destination, say Seattle, before they could not do it. They would have to stop somewhere else to get the fuel. Now they can go non-stop with more fuel. So it has nothing to do with noise. It is just simply the ability to be able to go longer distances, and, two, is coming in with the profile that in fact reduces noise because they have more room to work with.

Mr. Borrer:

Thank you.

Dean Baeslack:

Yes?

Mr. O'Dell:

The runway that you are removing, how long is it and how many takeoffs and landings does it have?

Dean Baeslack:

I am, again, going to defer that to Doug here.

Mr. Hammon:

It is, if I remember correctly, right around 4,000-feet. It handles probably about 2-2.5 percent of our traffic throughout the year.

Mr. O'Dell:

So you are actually going to reduce the number of feet of runway out there by taking one out and lengthening the other?

Mr. Hammon:

Right.

Mr. O'Dell:

Thank you.

Judge Duncan:

I take it that somewhere along the line we will receive information regarding the qualifications and work history of the consultants that did this work?

Dean Baeslack:

Yes, we would be happy to provide that to you; we will do that.

Mr. O'Dell:

How much is all this going to cost?

Dean Baeslack:

It varies depending upon what you are doing. I actually have some numbers here. These are approximate numbers. The runway extension at the north end I am showing, and correct me again these are some numbers that you gave me, Doug, \$6 million, 95 percent of which is FAA and 5 percent is the airport. The hangars on the south: \$8.5 million, revenue bonds to support that. The terminal would be \$15 million; again, airport and primarily private funds to support that. The flight education center: \$10 million and I mentioned that was private donations there.

Mr. O'Dell:

Is any of this improvement in the noise very contingent on one of the assumptions and if the assumption changed slightly, we would get a whole different picture?

Dean Baeslack:

Let me ask one of you to...

Mr. Hammon:

No, I do not believe so. I think what we are...all the projects from the beginning have been pretty much unrelated to each other. So it is not like if we build hangars we have to extend the runway, or vice versa. And the noise looks at each of those items separately, but lumps them together so we can look at what the overall impact is. Through the report you will get later, it does have all the projects even separated out – what if we only do one, what if we just do the other. You will be able to see that it is pretty consistent as the result, so you will see a consistency between them.

Mr. O'Dell:

I'm thinking about the runway extension and you know, if you have 10 more flights, does that all of a sudden cause five houses to have a problem on this measure.

Mr. Hammon:

No, those are actually incorporated into that...

Dean Baeslack:

...in the study.

Mr. Hammon:

We know that if we extend it, you know, there is going to be a limited number of increase that we have alluded to. That is already put into that factor.

Mr. O'Dell:

Right. And if we had more flights than that, then would we have a problem? Or is...

Mr. Hammon:

No, because really we still have some room out there. One of the things we will continue to look at over time is the reduction in the older engines. That is something we are going to keep our eye on. We are actually linked with a group we are working with to stress the reduction of the older engines – we are really looking at it closely.

Mr. O'Dell:

You are assuming that is going to happen, but do we have any way to assure that will happen?

Mr. Hammon:

Well, we are seeing industry trends. There has been a very sharp decrease within the last five years, and just like any older technology, there is a slight decrease for many years, because they were still new. The last five years had a very sharp decrease because like anything you have it gets too costly to maintain, the parts are not available. We expect to continue to see that sharp decrease into the future, where they are eventually out of the industry.

Mr. O'Dell:

And if they don't go away automatically, can we say, after a certain day, you cannot use these type of aircraft?

Mr. Hammon:

No, but that is why we are linked up with other airports looking at that specific issue.

Dean Baeslack:

I think these trends, you know, in terms of engine transition, is obviously based on national data and analyses by national consultants.

Mr. O'Dell:

But if we are going forward, we are relying on that to be the case, and I am sure there would be a lot of people very interested in that turning out to be correct.

Dean Baeslack:

Right.

Judge Duncan:

President Holbrook –

President Karen A. Holbrook:

Is there any buildable land around the airport right now that will be taken out of the real estate market as a result of any of the expansion plans?

Dean Baeslack:

I do not believe so.

Mr. Hammon:

We have everything we ever expect to need.

Mr. O'Dell:

The commercial property that we are talking about – who is that? What company is that?

Mr. Hammon:

Which one was that?

Dean Baeslack:

The one at the northwest that goes a little bit into those...

Mr. Hammon:

Oh, that is Fiesta Corporate Park just to the west of where the National Guard Armory used to be.

Mr. O'Dell:

Do they have any concerns or objections?

Mr. Hammon:

We have been working with them since before the 1990 plan. We have navigation easements over that area, so they have always been into the mix on any projects that we have worked on in terms of them understanding what is going on, and that coordination.

Mr. O'Dell:

So they would support this type of a project?

Mr. Hammon:

I believe they would.

Mr. O'Dell:

They haven't yet?

Mr. Hammon:

No.

Mr. O'Dell:

Thank you.

Judge Duncan:

Help me understand. We have a long term contractual relationship with the federal government regarding the continued operation of the airport and I need to know a bit about that. What process does the FAA demand that we follow in order to have these matters considered by the federal government? In other words, what do we have to do if we go forward with these matters to gain FAA approval? Or have they already approved the plan? I do not understand the FAA's relationship here.

Dean Baeslack:

This plan will go forward to the FAA after it has been approved by the University. And then the FAA will review it and make their approval, I presume, or make their decision on it.

Judge Duncan:

Is that the way it works?

Mr. Hammon:

Right. What it is, is the FAA looks at this as your airport and your plan. They are looking for you to tell them what you want to do, within their guidelines – within safety standards and operational considerations. Once you are done putting your plan together you submit it to them and ask them for their concurrence, and that it does meet all their standards and that it furthers the aviation industry. That is where they will come into it, concur that, yes, this is a viable, feasible plan.

Then, if it is a project similar to the runway extension, they will look at that as a major project and then ask you to go through the environmental assessment, which we are doing really concurrently with the master plan update so we can kind of hand them both to them at the same time, and then they can review it, after you have reviewed it, all as one large package.

Judge Duncan:

Thank you. Further questions? Thank you, sir. I appreciate it.

Next, I have on my agenda to call on Mr. Pello, the president of this interesting acronym, WOOSE. Mr. Pello, thanks for coming. Come over and talk to us. You have 15 minutes, sir.

Mr. Tony Pello:

Good morning. I will give you somebody on the ground's perspective on this, if I may.

Judge Duncan:

Sure.

Mr. Pello:

Thank you, Judge Duncan, and members of the committee for your time and consideration to the residents and neighbors of The Ohio State University's Don Scott Field. My name is Tony Pello, and I am a 22-year resident of Worthington, and currently president of the WOOSE organization, which is the acronym for We Oppose the Ohio State Airport Expansion.

We formed this citizen's action group to research the expansion issue, to better understand it, and to raise the issues profiled within the surrounding communities.

Our concerns began some 10-12 years ago, as the airport began a noticeable transition from what we believed was a small university community airport whose mission was focused on research and academics to something quite different. Residents have witnessed dramatic change in Don Scott relative to its size and scope during this transition. Today our communities are disrupted on a daily basis by corporate jet traffic that has greatly diminished the quality of our lives as well as our property values to a certain, but unknown extent.

The expansion plan under consideration would greatly add to the existing problems and would challenge us with an unknown future. In fact, the communities surrounding the airport today are far

too well developed and too valuable to impose upon in this manner. We believe that the window of opportunity for this enterprise closed a long time ago.

To date, the WOOSE organization has collected over 1,300 signatures from communities surrounding the airport in opposition to the expansion. Twenty-three percent of the signers are OSU alumni.

In the absence of an effective way for residents to voice their noise complaints, Worthington implemented an internet-based noise complaint system. Current levels of aircraft noise experienced by residents have resulted in over 8,000 noise complaints registered during the period of October 10, 2003, through August 30, 2004. These complaints came from 225 unique locations.

WOOSE has worked collaboratively with Worthington City Council and their residents to express our collective opinion and share research. OSU airport and Northwest Civic Association know of our position and our research on the expansion issue. Much of that research we will be sharing with this committee in a follow-up, which Mr. Frantz suggested we do.

We find a historical perspective associated with this issue that cannot be denied, because many of the airport's neighbors are valuable historic towns. Worthington alone has 33 historic sites that will be harmed by noise and fuel pollution. I think it is very important that we remember that historical zones provide both an identity as well as an economic base to older communities.

The current and proposed air corridors impose a hardship upon our schools. We count no less than 36 schools on the east side of the airport and 26 on the west side that will be impacted. This point is both disturbing but at the same time it offers some encouragement, as OSU understands, fosters, and derives a great benefit from the child development process taking place in our local schools. It is our hope that this will be a large consideration in your deliberative process.

We believe that the airport economic impact study that was dated in the summer of 2002 was not conducted according to approved FAA methodology and that some data may have been improperly used. The airport director has informed us that the airport is part of a current study being performed today by the Columbus Regional Airport Authority. However, there remain many questions as to the validity of the current study and we will cite those concerns to you in our follow-up, as well.

Some interesting questions to consider regarding the expansion:

- 1) Does the expansion plan meet the academic mission of the University? WOOSE believes and most residents support the airport's and the University's teaching mission as it relates to student pilots. However, the length in runway is not proposed for teaching. It is proposed for jets. The OSU program is not teaching or producing jet pilots. Jets are not part of the OSU educational program.
- 2) Should OSU use resources for the purpose of providing Columbus with yet a third international airport? The Central Ohio area currently has two fully developed international airports that are on a global search for business, and they are just 25-30 minutes away.
- 3) If runway safety margin is the main reason for expansion, shouldn't users patronize those airports that offer runways suitable to their aircraft. Port Columbus surely would be a better choice due to its longer runways, its 24-hour staffed tower, as well as fire and rescue equipment and personnel that are not shared with surrounding communities.

In summation, our hope is that you will consider our concerns and find, as we do, that any expansion of Don Scott is unacceptable under any circumstances or conditions. A no-build scenario and a return of the airport back to resemble something close to its original intent would be the preferable direction, thereby bringing relief to the communities of Riverlea, Indian Hills,

Worthington, and Dublin. These communities have been inundated by noisy jet aircraft and imposed upon for far too long.

At some point in the near future, this committee will recommend a direction for the airport. A build direction will forever change the communities I have cited previously. We respectfully ask that your deliberations are academically driven and that revenues from a corporate jet business that will benefit a few at the expense of many will be factored out.

I thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Judge Duncan:

Thank you, very much, sir. I would now like to call on Mary Jo Cusak, who will also address us.

Mr. O'Dell:

I would like to ask a couple questions, please.

Judge Duncan:

I'm sorry. Mr. Pello –

Mr. O'Dell:

Could you explain to me about what your measure is for the schools and the historic sites that are being impacted? How did you decide they are being impacted? I mean, is it a dB level, as we were talking about before, or is it some other measure?

Mr. Pello:

Well, I think that we will be following up with you with some scientific, if you will, information, but we do know that noise and fuel pollution does harm historical sites through many factors. I do not know that I want to get into a scientific discussion with you right now, but I think that it is fairly realistic to assume that a higher jet traffic, projected jet traffic, will impact on those buildings from vibrations and so forth. And there is a residue from jet fuel and other emissions that have an impact on that type of property.

Mr. O'Dell:

So it was not noise level at a school classroom, disrupting a class, or something like that, that you were talking about?

Mr. Pello:

Yes, sir. I am talking about – my first comments were relative to historical structures, but as far as schools are concerned, absolutely. You know, first of all, I am not so sure that a 65 dB is that important if you are isolating a certain number. I mean, I do not know what 45 means and I know that there is a measurable difference between 45 and 65, but when you are talking about children in a school classroom trying to learn, the difference between 45 and 65 is not significant in that there still is a very major disruptive factor.

We are pulling together some information right now that we would like to share with you and it is information that has been gathered nationally as to what airport noise and other types of intrusions, their impact on schools and school classrooms. I think as educators and people like yourselves, who are involved in education, noise is a factor. I mean, when children are disrupted from whatever their tasks are by noise or other disruption it is significant.

Mr. O'Dell:

Do the principals of these schools, for instance, have an opinion on this same topic?

Mr. Pello:

I do not think that they have expressed that at this point. I know they are aware that there is a problem with noise, but I have not had any comment from them that they are specifically interested at this point. I think that one comment that I have had from one of our people who have contacted a member of the school board was that they are doing what many others in the community are doing and they are taking a wait-and-see. They are waiting for the noise study to come in, they are waiting as far as the EA, and when this information comes in, then I assume they will have to take a position as to whether they agree with what is going to happen, or they don't, based on where they see the impacts, you know, based on whatever the decision in the building process.

Mr. O'Dell:

Thank you very much.

Mr. Pello:

Okay, thank you.

Judge Duncan:

Thank you, sir. Now may I call on Riverlea Mayor Mary Jo Cusack?

Mayor Mary Jo Cusack:

Thank you, Judge Duncan, and members of the committee, and thank you for allowing me to be here this morning to make this presentation on behalf of Riverlea. I will try not to repeat what Mr. Pello has said.

Riverlea comes at this from an entirely different perspective than WOOSE, because we have, for 20 years, been fighting with the airport over the jets that are coming in directly over Riverlea very, very low. In fact, I learned that they are lowering their landing gear over Riverlea and that is one of the problems.

For those of you who are not familiar with it, Riverlea is a community of about 500 people that is surrounded by Worthington. It is about five blocks south of 161, west of High Street.

Even under Ken Nordstrom, when he was the director of the airport, there were constant complaints. We were told to call the airport, register our complaints when we called. We were told there was no one there and no one ever called back.

So we have some concern about just how great a neighbor the OSU airport has been, at least for those of us in Riverlea. While Worthington is concerned about what is coming, we are concerned with what presently exists and has for the last 20 years. I will be sending you some petitions and some other information, copies of correspondence over those 20 years, prior to your December meeting.

We are concerned, again, about the mission, which we feel is very different from what is going on there right now with the landing of all these corporate jets. We do have a problem with fuel; people have complained to me that fuel is dripping from the planes onto their property and they have even written letters. The only letter that I have gotten telling me not to argue this case is from a woman

who couldn't sell her house in Riverlea and claimed that we should not let everybody know that we have a problem.

The last real estate closing I did, about two weeks ago, there was like a five or six page disclosure compared to the ones that when they first started were maybe one page. So it is only a matter of time before we are going to be required to disclose on real estate closings that we have got a noise problem from these planes.

About a week or two before the Muirfield tournament, one plane went over in the morning that just shook every house in Riverlea it was so noisy. Later that day one came in so low that everybody ducked – it hit some of the tops of the trees. These were jets; these are not little planes. And if you think we are not concerned, we are. There is a concern about the fact that no one knows who goes into that airport at night, and there are a lot of rickety old planes that go over Riverlea at night. I have one resident who has submitted about 1,000 complaints to the WOOSE website, complaining about noise, documenting the time of all of these planes going over.

I think that the noise study is an average – it doesn't tell you what happens when these individual jets go over. You cannot sit out on the patio, you cannot talk on the phone. It is just very unreal. Riverlea was there before the airport. It was incorporated in 1939, and the airport was, you just stated, 1942. My home was built in 1946 and I think most of the homes there are older homes and a lot of people have lived there more than 20 years.

We have had meetings with Doug Hammon and I think he is probably aware of something you are not and that is the anger toward Ohio State that exists in the community. People are concerned about the way they have been treated by Ohio State and I know that I have gotten an awful lot of phone calls and letters saying "thank you" for fighting this battle for us. In fact, I suspect that that is probably why I got elected mayor is because, good, she will keep on fighting this battle against Don Scott.

So, you know, I would just stress to you that continuing to expand this airport is equivalent to stealing property from the people who have homes there. The homes are going to be devalued if this continues to go on.

We would like, we have asked that they re-route the planes over 270 or that they do something. We are told that they cannot do that, that the pilots have the choice of where they come in. We have tried everything for 20 years and we have gotten no cooperation. So we are asking not only that you not expand, but that you also consider getting rid of these jets that are presently landing there and are presently presenting issues for Riverlea.

We do appreciate the opportunity to be here. We have a lot of OSU grads, professors, retired people, other people associated with OSU. They are all very upset and we think you need to know that.

So thank you for your time, and I will answer any questions.

Judge Duncan:

Questions?

Mr. O'Dell:

I have one for the dean: the question about peak noise or noise for an individual plane are aggravation caused by low-flying planes or safety issues. Is that in any way taken into account in the study we were just talking about? Because averages are one thing, but moments in time that disrupt everybody, that is also interesting and important and I did not hear anything about that.

Dean Baeslack:

There are certainly – the analysis does allow you to look at the maximum noise levels, but certainly the maximum noise levels are higher than 65 dB, 65 is the average.

Mr. O'Dell:

Is there a standard for a maximum?

Dean Baeslack:

I do not believe there is an FAA – again Doug and Nawal – maximum in terms of an event of a maximum decibel level. But they surely go up into the 80s and 90s in a single event of an aircraft over, you know, taking off or landing over homes that are near the end of the runway.

Mr. O'Dell:

I think that is an important issue. I mean, you know, if there are only two planes, but it is very, very loud, you are going to get a big spike and that is a problem. Do we have such a problem now and does this make it better or worse?

Dean Baeslack:

On average, it makes it better. Certainly at the ends of the north runway, those individuals will – less at the south runway, because there will be a shifting toward the north runway, and a balancing. So in terms of single events, there will be fewer on the south side and more on the north side.

The average is certainly a function of many factors. It is obviously a function of the number of takeoffs and landings and the noise, or actually energy levels created during each of those events. If you have louder single events, it is going to cause that average to go up. So it is a combination of both of those. Again, the fact is that the technology is driving that maximum down, you know, to lower levels.

But there is still no question that, I think if you look at the changes will be in the preferred scenario, the fact is if you look at the numbers, it will be about nine or 10 additional takeoffs and landings per day.

If you look at the difference between 1990, 14 years ago, and today, there are 6.5 more takeoffs and landings today than there were 14 years ago, in terms of jets. If you looked at the preferred build that is actually going to go, you know, over the next five or six years it will go up to – I have got eight per day more. So the number will go up but the technology is improving so that is why that average comes down.

In terms of the maximum noise, that will also decrease. But the maximum noise is not insignificant. I mean, you have been, I am sure, close enough to an airport and listened to a corporate jet take off. I personally live in Gahanna, in Blacklick, just west of Gahanna, so I understand the issues from a Port Columbus standpoint also. So the single events are loud. I would say that the single event noise level should decrease because of technology although, again, over a five or six year period we will expect some growth in the numbers. But again we are talking about – based on this analysis, eight per day. Any increase in 14 years has been about six to seven per day in terms of those single events. So, I hope that...

Dr. Taneja:

Not only will noise go down as technology improves for engines but, as I said before, if you have a longer runway then the pilot who is coming in or going out is going to come in or go out at a

different power setting because you have more room to maneuver with than if you have shorter. So from that point of view that pilot will be flying in at a very different profile if he or she knows that I have a lot more room to work with. And as such, that single event when he or she does take off, will be less because you have more to work with.

So those are the two factors: in the technology and the ability to be able – I mean think about driving your own car. You have got a certain amount of distance you got to work with, you are going to behave differently than if you knew you got a lot more to play with.

Mayor Cusack:

Could I just comment on that?

Judge Duncan:

Yes.

Mayor Cusack:

The south runway is going to continue to be open and to operate. What if more – a lot of hangars are being built next to the south runway. So it is not going to solve Riverlea's problem to have that other runway expanded.

Judge Duncan:

Question?

Mr. O'Dell:

Are we going to lower the number of flights on the other runway?

Mayor Cusack:

I doubt it. We have been told two different things. I know I have met for some time with Doug Hammon and people I think from Indian Hills and Preston Way and a couple of other places. And he had asked if we wouldn't sign off on extending the north runway because it would be beneficial to Riverlea in that the flights would no longer go over Riverlea. That of course would dump it on our good neighbor Worthington, which we did not think was quite the good thing to do, so we did not do it.

But in one of the advisory committee meetings, someone asked Mr. Hammon if all the flights were going to go on the north runway, and he said, "No, most of them would stay on the south runway." So, I mean, he is a charming man, but I have gotten two different answers. And my trust is a little shaky.

Judge Duncan:

Any further questions? Thank you, Mary Jo.

Mayor Cusack:

Thank you, very much.

Judge Duncan:

You are very welcome. Mr. Shkurti? Timelines?

Mr. Shkurti:

Mr. Chairman, the next step in this whole process will be to complete the internal reviews within the University and those will include the following issues:

- The aviation academic plan and the role of the University airport in supporting that plan;
- The airport's business plan and its implications for both the airport and the College of Engineering, and then also the University;
- The review of the various elements of the airport master plan;
- A review of the noise study that we were just discussing;
- Continued work with the FAA regarding University land outside the airport, which is in itself a complicated issue;
- Transitional planning on the effects on other University users of airport area property – should we go forward with this?; and
- Then additional opportunities for and consideration of public input.

This will occur during September and October as the College of Engineering moves the plan through the regular University processes.

During the same time, there will be additional opportunities for public comment and review. There is a handout, at least I have it, I do not know if it has been distributed yet, about a tentative timeline regarding the airport master plan and in that it refers to an Airport Advisory Committee meeting in mid-October which will also include a public forum, and then late October or early November a public hearing as required by the Federal Aviation Administration.

Then it is our hope to come back at the November 5 OSU Board meeting and make a presentation of a plan to the Fiscal Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees and this plan, submitted to the Board, will reflect consideration of all the input received. We will not be asking for a vote at that November meeting. Rather, based on our two-meeting policy, the plan would then be considered by the Board at the December meeting for a possible vote, should the Board choose to do so.

If the plan is adopted by the Board, it will be submitted to the FAA for formal approval. Any changes requested by the FAA will be presented to the Board of Trustees of the University for approval before they can take effect.

By the end of this calendar year, we also expect to have closure with the FAA on their determination regarding University property outside the airport. And then, once all the plan approvals have been obtained, the airport will begin consideration of capital projects contained within the plan and move those through the University administration for Board of Trustees consideration during calendar year 2005 and beyond.

Judge Duncan:

Thank you. First, I would like to thank Mr. Pello and Ms. Cusack for their straightforward comments.

I would like to take the liberty to speak on behalf of my colleagues to say that not for one second do we underestimate the sincerity of your concerns or the importance of the issues you raise. We

understand that. We will continue to monitor the processes that have been identified and make every attempt that we can to make ourselves knowledgeable, so that when the time to make this decision comes, it will be fair and reasonable and done with the best knowledge we can accumulate regarding the issues.

Dr. David O. Frantz:

Just one correction in the tentative timeline. The brief report at the Board of Trustees meeting from the Facilities Planning Committee will not be to the full Board but to the Fiscal Affairs Committee of the Board.

Judge Duncan:

Okay.

Mr. O'Dell:

I would like to also suggest that when we hear about this again, that the specific issues that have been raised here today and others that are of concern are addressed. And that if we do decide to go ahead, that we should try to incorporate an improvement for the surrounding residence in terms of safety, noise, pollution, and all of these issues compared to where we currently are. We would like to try to get, to the extent possible, everybody's buy-in on that.

Judge Duncan:

Any further business for the committee this morning? If not, I will declare the meeting adjourned. Thank you very much.